G. R. S. 59j

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

---

19 04
(Miscl.)

File No. 33

Serial Nos. 1 – 15

Papers Filed.

Month March 1911.

SUBJECT.

In re the Archakship of the Sri Vara raja Swami temple at Ganagalur in the Hoskote Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	345-13
	Misc Dep. Memo dt 30-3-11

Mzr. S] 190 .

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

OFFICE NOTE.

File No.

SUBJECT.

In re the Archakship of the Sri Varadarajaswamy temple at Ganagalur in the Hoskote Talk.

FROM

Archak Rangappa.

Petition No 3012 Dated 17th December 1906.

One Rangappa having appealed to this office against the Dy. Commr. order re the Archakship of the Sri Varadarajaswamy temple at Ganagalur in the Hoskote Talk, his appeal was referred for report to the Dy. Commr. of the Bangalore Distt. (Vide docket no. 2848 dy 27th Nov. 1906) The report on the subject is awaited. In the meanwhile, the said individual has presented in person another petition wherein he states the

File No. 33 of 1906 Muzrai Secretariat.

The Archakship in question has been in his enjoyment without any obstruction, for a long time past; and that attempts is being made through the Taluk authorities, to compel him to be dispossessed of the post. He therefore prays that pending the decision of his appeal, orders may be issued for stay of execution of the Dy. Commrs order. 271

Submitted. to the 2nd Councillor

I think stay of execution may be ordered pending disposal of the appeal.

T Ananda Rao
20/12/06

approved
20/12/06

Order accdly
20/12/06

GPB-2000-18-2 05

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 33 of 1906

Note continued

5 Orders were accordingly issued requesting the Deputy Commissioner to hold the execution of his order in abeyance pending the disposal of the appeal.

6 That officer has submitted a detailed report thereon together with the Vernacular records bearing on the Subject.

From the Vernacular records it is observed as follows: —

(Slip A) 1 The temple of Sri Varadarajaswamy consecrated by Jananejaya Raya at Ganagalur in the Hoskote Taluk is an ancient muzrai institution, being endowed with Inam lands. Venkatappa was the Pujari who is said to have effected some improvements at his cost. After him, his son Varadappa attended to the worship of the temple. As he was Sonless,

GPB—3,000—22-6 06

File No. 33 of 1906 | Muzraï Secretariat.

he brought up his sister's son by name Thimmiah and when the latter came of age, gave him his daughter in marriage, and transferred all his properties including the Pujaarship to his son-in-law.

8 Thimmah deposed before the Amildar on the 18th may 1906, that his father-in-law Varadiah had neither brothers nor sons, that after his death some 20 or 25 years ago, he became the Pujari; that as his sight was defective, he had appointed as his Gumastha one Sanjeevappa of Chennarayapura and left the Village some 5 years back; that his Gumastha was doing Puje for some time, and after his death, the Villagers appointed one Rangappa quite unconnected with his family; that his son aged 20 years is of unsound mind and that his — (Slip B)

whereabouts are unknown; and prays that Ramachar, his brother's son might be allowed to look after the work.

9 On the other hand, the appeal-petitioner Rangappa states that he and his ancestors have been enjoying the right to Archakship for upwards of 100 years, that about 45 years ago, Sanjeeviah borrowed 28 pagodas from one Venkatappa and mortgaged his right to him; that about 14 years ago, he redeemed his right of Archakship and obtained possession of the said office and that since then, he has been doing the duty and prays that under the circumstances, his possession may not be disturbed

(Slip C)

(Slip D)

In a previous deposition before the Amildar, ∝ Dt 24th March 1908 the said individual states that —

File No. 33 of 1906 | Muzrai Secretariat.

Thimmah, Archak of the temple left the village some 8 years back without telling the villagers; that since then, he has been doing puje; that the villagers obtained Govt orders to that effect; that he has no other means of maintenance, that he has been residing in Gangalur and enjoying the temple lands and prays that he may be confirmed in his post.

11. It is further observed that there are two factions in the village, one siding with Rangappa, and the other with Timmiah. The Hobli Sheikdar (Slip E) states that Ramachar nominated by Timmiah is quite competent to do puje work. Timmiah is reported to be under the protection of Ramachar.

12. The Deputy Commissioner (Paper under dis

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 33 of 1906

has submitted a detailed report on the subject, wherein he states that — Thimmiah appeared before him and after holding a personal enquiry, he issued orders to get his name registered as Archak of the temple, and to permit his brother's son to look after the work. Thimmiah has petitioned praying for the confirmation of the fore-going orders. Against these orders, Rangappa has appealed to Govt.

(Slip F)

Submitted.
19/3/07

13 This appears to be a case in which the contending parties may be heard by the 2nd Commissioner before a decision is given. If approved, I shall post the case to Saturday the 25th May.

Subject to the 2nd Yr. 1/4 Yrs please

V Ananta Sami Rao 20/3/07

BPR 20/3/07

Given notices 20/3/07

GPB—3,000—22 6 06

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.



Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 33 of 1906

The facts of the case are as follow

15. On the 25th September 1899 the Shanbhogue of the Gangadeva Hobli submitted a report to the Tahsildar stating that Viswanath Acharya of the Varadarajaswami temple went to some other place, appointing one Sanjeevappa to officiate for him, misbehaved and that he died on telling the Gramastas. He requested permission to take current work from him. In reply the Amildar gave an order to the Shanbhogue on the 25th September 1899 directing that the work be taken from Sanjeevappa who had been deputed by the Rajani Viswanath and at the same enquiring as to when the latter and where went and why he did not obtain

(Map 5)

permission ~~from~~ before he left—
The Shekadar's explanation was required
as to why he omitted to report immediately
after the pujari went away—

16 There was no reply to the above
for 14 months and it does not
appear that the Swamy Sanjivappa
continued to do the work.

17 On the 20th October 1900
the Shekadar obtained a ~~mahazar~~ x Page 5)
from some of the residents of the village
to the effect that as per orders (import-
there were ~~no~~ such orders) Sanjivappa's
son-in-law, by name Ramyappa
and the puja work living in the village;
that Shivamallu who had gone away
a few years ago had not returned, that
his son Venkatramanna was of unsound
mind and was stated to be an outcaste
and that Ramyappa might therefore
be appointed permanent pujari—

The

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. 33. of 1906

The Shirastadar forwarded his
report to the Taluk on the 25th June 1906 and
solicited orders —

1st In the course of local
enquiry, Shivamurti, who was known
have gone to Jayakatti village in
a Devanahalli Taluk, gave a statement
upon the Shirastadar of Jala Hobli
and the head of Come to Hud-
dange a year ago but that he was
ve to go back on account of plague
and of his eye defects; that he had
appointed Sanjeevappa on his
behalf as alleged by the villagers,
that the allegations of the villagers
about this Son were false, and that
his Son should therefore be appointed
until then
injure and that ~~he should be~~ by
his uncle's (father's brother) Son
Ranganatha might be appointed for the
present. Though these papers were forwarded

(7193

* In subsequent correspondence the name of

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. 33 of 1906

by the Amildar of the Devanhalli Taluk to the Amildar of the Hoskote Taluk on the 20th December 1900 no proper action appears to have been taken in the matter upto till 1905.

19 In 1905 ~~the~~ correspondence again began and there were 2 factions in the village, one party recommending the continuation of Ramyappa who had continued to do the puja, and the other party supporting the prayer of Thimmiah that his uncle's son Ramachari should be appointed. The Amildar Mr V. N. Lyer Rao recommended the ~~registry~~ which was to the effect that his nephew's son Ramachari should be appointed on 26-9-05 registry of the Inamment to Ramyappa's name as the ground that ~~he~~ he had been doing the puja for the past 10 or 15 years. Mr Balasundaram Iyer thereupon observed that Thimmiah's claim to puja by ~~he~~ could not be unrecognised as he was doing

the

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 33 of 1906

work prior to Ramayappa and enquired if his brother's son Ramachari was not competent.

On this one B.C. Krishna Sastri, Amildar, ~~reported on the 16th January 1906 that Ramachari was competent in every way.~~ took down the statement of Thimmiah, who deposed that his father-in-law Varadappa who was the pujari of the temple died 20 or 25 years ago and that as he (Thimmiah) had no male heirs he transferred the puja that descended to him as being his son-in-law; that he (Thimmiah) continued to do the work since his death but being unable to do it any longer

GPB—3,000—22-6 06

File No. 33 of 1906 | Muzrai Secretariat.

lawyer he appointed Lingayya on his behalf, who subsequently died. He further stated that after his death the villagers appointed Ramayya who was quite unconnected; and that the whereabouts of his son, who is insane, was not known — With this statement the Assistant Mr B. C. Krishnaswamy reported to the Dy Comr that Shivaiah's brother's son Ramachari was competent in every way to be the Pujari.

Thereupon the Dy Comr Mr Sparkes issued an order on the 8th August 1906 directing the registry of the puja hereditary in Shivaraya's name and appointing his brother's son Ramachari

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 33 of 190 6

to do the puja work -

The present appeal to
Government by Rangappa
against the above order -

The appellant says that
the puja work of the temple has been
in the enjoyment of his family
for over 100 years, that also
45 years ago his (appellant
father Lingavirah had mortgaged
the pujaridhi to Varadappa
father Venkatappa for 28 rupees
that about 18 years ago
redeemed the hak by payment
of the amount to the mortgagee
wife ~~Gudabai~~ Lakkamma
has been since then in the
enjoyment of the hak, and that
2 fractions in the village of

abstract 5th Feb 1906

C

appellant

GPB—3,000—22 6 06
GPB—3,000—22 6 06

File No. 253 of 1906 | Muzrai Secretariat.

one of them has been trying
to have the work transferred to
Varadappa's son-in-law Shivaraiah -
He prays that justice be meted out - But-
has not produced any documents in support of his
allegations
Thus stands the case -

Submitted

25/5/07 Appellant Rangappa - Respondent
Shivaraiah & his brothers son
Ramacharry - present.
also their Advocates Mr. B. Sreenivasa Rao
for Mr Subbayyashastry and
Mr B. Sivanalachar.

adjourned at the request of the appellants
to 30th May 07.

25/5/07

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 33 of 1906

The Advocates for the appellant and respondents were before the 2nd Councillor today. Advocate M. D. Raghavachar on behalf of the appellant Ramgappa produced two documents to show that the father of the appellant mortgaged the Archakship in question to Venkatappa father of Varadappa and redeemed the mortgage bond by paying the amount to Puttamma wife of Varadappa & recovered back the Archakship The Advocate urged that the Puja hak was in the family of Ramgappa & that after the redemption of the mortgage the appellant was in the enjoyment

GPB—3,000—22-6 06

File No. 33 of 1906 | Muzrai Secretariat.

of the Puja office for the past 18 years. Mr. B. Viswanathan advocate for the respondent Mussulmans urged that the two documents now relied upon by the appellant were produced for the first time today & that why they were not produced before the Amildar when he held the enquiry is doubtful. The 2nd Councillor directed that the two documents now produced should be sent to the Dy. Commr. and that he be requested to report as to whether the fact that for the past 18 years Ramappa has been doing Puja, is true. Let it be with a draft

30/5/06

Issue the draft

30/5/06

(20)

12]
and Revenue
Secretariat.

477

File No. 33 of 1906

18

Serial No.

To, The Dy. Commr, Bangalore Dist
Letter no. 5736 Dy 6.6.1907
-Calls for further inform in the Subje
From., the Dy Commr, Bangalore Dist
Letter no 14 Dy 15.9.1910
Submits further report

(Paper under disposal)

The Dy. Commrs. report explains fully the facts of the case

During the hearing of this case by the 2nd Cr (the present 1st Cr) on 30th May 1910, aplt Rangappa produced two documents to show that the aplts. father mortgaged the Archakship in question to Venkatappa father of Varadappa and redeemed the mortgage bond by paying the amount to Puttamma wife of Varadappa and got back the Archakship under orders, these documents were forwarded to the Dy Commr for report as to whether these are genuine and whether Rangappa was doing Puje for the past 18 years.

(Para 4)

After fully discussing the facts of the case, the Dy. Commr reports that the documents in question are not

Note.—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27.4.09

eral and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Serial No.

Sealed dispatch before Skelton J. Jaffa on 19/12/1907

A

Y. dated 6.9.1905

X

As stated in para 15 above the correspondence originated in 1899 and though in 1900 Thimmiah respondent claimed the office for himself stating that Sanjeevappa is out of possession and that appellant Rangappa should not be approached for work or further steps to have the puja restored to him file 1905 when in August some of the Villagers petitioned the Amildar in favour of Thimmiah

It is said in his petition of the opposite faction Skelton's report that there are interested in ~~Oosti~~ Oosti's appeal Rangappa as he wanted them to vacate the Temple lands they had encroached upon The Amildar in his report No 222 of 26.9.1905 says that except four people, all the other Villagers are in favour of the appellant. After further correspondence Mr Sparkes ordered that respondent Thimmiah should be registered as archak.

Rangappa has appealed against from this order and says that he is the hereditary archak, that his father Sanjeevappa had mortgaged the office to Venkatappa for the sum of Rs and 20 Varahas in 1859, that he (appellant) redeemed the mortgage by paying the money to Varadappa's wife Padmamma in the year Sarvadhari (1889 A.D.) that he has been performing puja since then

The DS Court having been requested to report on

BPG—55,000—27-1-09

Serial No.

genuine and that Rangappa had been performing puja subsequent to 1899 i.e for 10 or 11 years and not for the past 18 years as alleged by them. Submitted for orders

MG 5/10/10 RG

Same note is for the 15th instant. I have now put file

B 10.1910

N! Submit with DFT notes,
RG 7/10/10

Submitted

From a perusal of the records it is found that the following facts are proved:-

(1) That Venkatachar was pujari

(2) That he was succeeded by his son Varadachar

(3). That Varadachar was succeeded by his son-in-law Thimmaiah (the respondent).

[Appellant does not admit this]

(4). That the respondent Thimmaiah left the village in 1899 and

(5). That one Sanjeevachar of Channarayapatna in the Malur Taluk performed puja for a short time after Respondent Thimmaiah left and that since then the appellant Rangaiah has taken charge of the Sanjeevachar and has been performing puja.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

(22)

(21)

R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 33 of 1906

Serial No.

principal effect if there any other one and the documents are genuine says that the documents are not genuine and that appellant is been performing puja since 1899 only

No reference is made to this mortgage when Ragoba (appellant) was examined on 24.3.1905 and 15.12.1905 or in any of the petitions presented in his favour till March 1906 when for the first time this mortgage is referred to in a petition presented by the appellant to this Court.

Of the two documents produced by appellant one is this mortgage dated of 1875 and the other is a deed of 1874 purporting to be executed by appellant in favour of Varadappa promising to pay with the mortgage money the sum of Rs. 10 which Varadappa had spent in repairing the Ancestral house.

The Writer and attestors of these appear to be dead. None has been examined of the attestors of the endorsement of repayment has so dead and one — Lobo with Varadappa — is alive and has been examined the agents of the repayment. The Writer of this endorsement — Appaji — is reported to be alive But the two Appavus (11th & 13th) that have been examined do not appear to be the Writers.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

(22)

and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 33 of 1906

Serial No.

Witnesses 4, 8, 9 and 12 have also been cited by appellant. The 4th witness has a knowledge of Temple affairs since 10 or 12 years ago. The 8th and 9th say that redemption was talked about. The 12th says he was present at repayment.

The first was also practically examined at the instance of the appellant as to Bhajantri; but his evidence in no way helps appellant.

The others seem to have been examined at the instance of Respondent.

Submitted to Hon'ble Bench

Ahmadnagar

24.11.1910

Mr D Raghavachar heard for Petr.

The Amildar's report & Dy Cr's decision about genuineness of appt's docs. not correct. Appt has been long in possession.

Resp't heard.

(To see record & Mahr Lady)

BPG—55,000—27 4 09

25/11/10

(23)

S Revenue at. | File No. 33 of 1906 9214

Serial No.

The documents were introduced at a very late stage and the Dy Cr is right in holding that they have not been proved.

The appeal may be dismissed & the D.C.'s order confirmed.

6/12/10

Submitted with a draft letter for Board's Member

6/12/10

From, Rangappa.

Petition dated 30th Nov 1910

Says that on the date of hearing the facts noted in the present petition were not properly urged and prays that these should

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BRG—55,000—27-4-09

Revenue
at.

File No. 393 of 1906

Serial
No.

Considered
Submitted

337 There is nothing new alleged in the petn except that the enquiry held is not found and that a fresh enquiry should be ordered

Abdulmajid

1033. Draft above 6/12/1910

13/12

To, The Dy. Commr, Bangalore Dist

Memo no 1609 Dy 20th Decr 1910.

Passes orders on the Archakship of Sri Varadarajaswamy Temple at Gangalur, Hoskote Taluk.

To, Mr D Raghavachar, Advocate for the Aplt and respt Thimmappa

Endts. nos 1610-11 Dy 20 12 1910

Forwards copy of the above,

From, Archak Rangappa.

Petition Dy 25 1 1911

Prays that the above order may be renewed by ordering a fresh enquiry

U. Secretary's order:— .... put up Endt saying that there are no grounds for

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

(25)

enue
at.

File No. 33 of 1906 1301

Serial No.

ordering a fresh enquiry.

49 Submitted with a 8ft. enrolled counterpart

AH/1329 RL
31.1.1911
8 2

Abstracting

9/1/1911

1475

I wish to verify that the allegation that the Petrs had no previous opportunity to present the papers (in issue) is unfounded.

14/2/11

Remunitted

I respectfully invite reference to the petition marked on page 21 of this note from which it will be seen that the petrs made no reference in their mortgage or documents till March 1906 that they could have produced them at the earlier State. From the March 1906 he did not produce the documents in a petn it may be noted with the Dy Comr should have carefully scanned all the petitions and called for their documents before passing the order of 14th August 1906 which was appealed against This was not done. The Dy Comr has himself stated as detailed by petrs held an enquiry through

GPB—50 000—12 6 10

(26)

and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 33 of 1906

Serial No.

4977

his statement and that found with the documents are not genuine.

Abdulmajid

18/2/1911

Draft rejecting the petn approved —

3/3/11

Issued 7/3/1911

To, Ganagalur Rangappa,

Endt no 2380 dy 23-3-1911

Informs him that there are no grounds for ordering a fresh enquiry.

To, the Dy. Commr, Bangalore Dist

No 2381 dy 23-3-1911

Forwards copy of the above.

To, Munimapper.

no 2382 dy 23-3-1911

Forwards copy of the above.

From, Akkalappanavara Ramiah & other 4 pets

Petition dy 21-3-1911

Pray that Rangappa may be appointed to the Archaks post.

The petition is addressed to the Councillor - An endorsement in Terms of

NOTE— Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8-10

12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 33 of 1906

Serial No.	
	The Councillor's orders recorded on the petition is herewith submitted.
	Submitted. Issue AM (32) D 28/7/1911 31/3/1914

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8-10

12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 19

Serial No.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Presented by
Mr Subraya Mudaliar
Advocate —
Register and
bring up please
5/9/06







ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

19 — 19 ನೇ ಇನವಿ ನಂಬರು.

ಹಾಜಿ.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

ಮಃ ರಾ ವರಿಗೆ.

ಬರಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ತಿನಾಮ.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ನಂಬರ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾನು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕ್ರೀ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಸಹ ಪಡದುಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗಾಗಿ ವಾಪಸು ಆಗುವ ದಾವಾ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು ಪ್ರೋಸಸ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು ಸಹ ಪಡದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಬಾಬತು ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ದಸ್ತ್ರವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಸಹ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನಡಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇರ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು

ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ್ ನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುವದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಇರ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ್ ನಾಮೆನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇರ್ತೇನೆ.

☞ ಈ ಫಾರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ ಪಾಪ್‌ಕೀಪರ್ ಯು. ನಂಜರಡಪ್ಪನವರಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತೆ.

Vichara Darapana Press, Bangalore—1903.



50



Produced by advocate Mr. S. Nageswarappa
on behalf of Ramappa.
20/5/07

Endorsement-

granted to Ranganatha,
Archak of the Varada-
-rajaswami temple
at Kanjeevaram in the
Chingleput District (thro
his Advocate Mr
Subramanya Ayyar),
in reply to his petition
Regd no 1369 dated
the 5th September 1906

The petitioner
is informed that
he should produce
an authenticated
copy of the Dy Comr's
order referred to
in

Apl 18/06 9/28 9.06

the Endorsement-
granted to him by the
present Dy Commr
Mrs Sparkes.

2. The enclosures
to his petition under
reply are herewith
returned -

By order
26/9/06
Secretary

Mumpal Dept-

ks
26/9/06



(illegible)

(illegible)

(illegible)

Refer
14/11/06

2464

Put up the papers
with submit
Early
14/11/06

13
12

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಯ-ಅಸಂಇ-೨೨೬೬-೨೦೦೬ } ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ,
ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೨೧-೧೧-೨೦೦೬ ಕಂದಾಯ (ಅಸಂಇ) ಇಲಾಖೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

ವಿಷಯ: ಕಂದಾಯ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಂಘದ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಕುರಿತು.

ಕಂದಾಯ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಂಘದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1959 ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1960 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಂಘದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಉಪನಿಬಂಧಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿಬಂಧಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ನೇಮಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು ಮನವಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ಆದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ.

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ, 1959 ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ನಿಯಮಗಳು, 1960 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಂಘದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಉಪನಿಬಂಧಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿಬಂಧಕರು ಅಥವಾ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ನೇಮಿಸಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಆದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ.

ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆದೇಶದಂತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ,

ಸಹಿ/-
(ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯ)
ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ,
ಕಂದಾಯ (ಅಸಂಇ) ಇಲಾಖೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

1022

MWR:33-06

VII
6/12/88

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਕੈਲਾਸ਼ ਦੇਵੀ

ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਕੈਲਾਸ਼ ਦੇਵੀ ਪਤਨੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਰਾਮ ਪ੍ਰਸਾਦ ਵਾਸੀ

ਮੁਹੱਲਾ ਨਵਾਂ ਸ਼ਹਿਰ ਤਹਿ ਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਹੁਸ਼ਿਆਰਪੁਰ

2

3

24

ಅಂಗರಾಸಪ್ಪಚಾಲ್ರಾಕಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು

2 D4-7 SCS

Mur. 1 A]

190

From

To

The Dy Commr

Bangalore Dist

Dated

Despatched 27/11/06

Received

General No. 1271

No.

Enclosure No.

Has the honor to

forward herewith petitions

registered nos 2464 dated 136 & 9 and

5th Sept and 14th November 1906 ~~from~~

respectively, together

with their enclosures, Rangappa of Gauagalur

from in the Hoskote Taluk

appealing against the

Dy. Commrs. order re

the Archakship of the

Sri Varadarajaswamy

Temple

G I B—3 (00—21 7 05

temple at the place and
the minimum of
To request ~~[illegible]~~ a detailed
report on the subject together
with the form recommended
relating thereto ~~[illegible]~~
~~[illegible]~~
~~[illegible]~~

15-12-06
Chidambaram

Presented in person

Office to take steps and note whether there are any grounds to stay Execution

13/12/06

Draft as her Cis arden
2 Dfts
817

May 1 [illegible]

190

From

To

The Deputy Commr.,
Bangalore Dt

Dated

Despatched 24-12-1906.

Received

General No. 3304
No.

Enclosure No.

In continuation of this Office No 2848, dated 27th November 1906, forwarding for submission of connected papers, the appeal petition of Rangappa, regarding the Archakship of the Sri Varadarajaswami temple at Ganagalur in the Hoskote Taluk, has the honor to ~~forward the said~~ state that the said ~~appeal the said petitioner~~

GPB—8 000—21 7 06

~~dated 19/12/06 the Deputy Commissioner,~~

~~received from the same~~

individual, has petd to Govt. praying for

stay of the execution of

the Deputy Commissioner's order

in the matter, pending the disposal of his

appeal to Govt. // The Deputy

Commissioner is requested

to hold in the execution

of his order in abeyance, pending

the disposal of the appeal

~~as prayed for by the petitioner~~

By order,

22/12/06

Secretary

21

20/12/06

Ref Ors ordrs

2 Dfts

Muz. 7]

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

No. 3305-46. Dated 24 December 1906

ENDORSEMENT granted to Rangakka, Archak of the Sri Varadaraja swamy temple at Ganagalur in the Hosakote Taluk,

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 3012, dated 17th Dec 1906, praying for stay of the execution of the order of the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore Dt depriving him of his post, pending the disposal of his appeal thereof.

Petitioner is informed that the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore Dt has been requested to stay execution of his order in the matter pending the disposal of his appeal, ~~as prayed for by him~~

By order,

Secretary,

27/12/06

Ps

No. 3306 Copy to the Dy Commr, Bangalore Dt for info-n

By Order,

Secretary, Murai Department.

Ps
26/12/06

GPB—1000—27-6-06

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4105
6.307
MAT

Ref

Ds
6/3/07

S(9

1906)

From

The Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore Dist.

To

The Secy to Govt. of Mysore
Revenue Dept.

Dated 5th

Despatched 6th March 1907.

Received

General No.
M.S No. 129

Enclosure No. 1 file.

His No- 2548 of 27.11.06
& 3304 of 24.12.06

Reports on the petitions
of Ranganatha of Ganapalli
in the Hoskote Taluk Re
the Archakship of the
Varadaraja Swami temple

N.S. 129
E. 16ce.

Bangalore District
Dy. Commrs Office
5. March 1907.

From H. H. Sparkes Esquire
Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore Dist.

To
L. Anantarami Rao Esquire B.A.
Secretary to Govt of Mysore
Madras Depll.

Sir
With reference to your N. 2848 dated 27th November 1906 and N. 3304 dated 24. December 1906 requesting the submission of a detailed report on the petitions Regd. Nos. 1369 and 2464 dated 5th September and 14. November 1906 respectively from one Rangappa of Ganagalur in the Hoskote Taluk appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order re the Archakship of the Sri Varadarajaswami temple

at the place together with the
vernacular records relating
thereto, I have the honor to state
as follows

The appeal petitioner states
that he has been the claimant
for the Archakship of the temple
under reference from the time
of his father and grand father
and that about 28 years ago
his father Sanjiviah mortgaged the
Archakship to one Venkatappa
father of Varadappa, both of whom
after enjoying the archakship for
some time died and that after who
he paid the mortgaged amount to
one Puttammawife of the mortgag
and recovered back the archaksh
which he has been in the enjoymen
of, for the past 18 years.

If, according to his above statement, he were the real claimant for the archakship in question, he could have made a similar statement before the Amildar, who held an enquiry into the matter during march 1905; but on the contrary he stated that one Thirumiah was in charge of the temple and that during the absence of this Thirumiah from the Dalak without permission the villagers among whom he professed to have been very popular, after obtaining Govt. permission, appointed him as the Archak of the temple.

It is however observed from the correspondence that the said Venkatappa and Varadappa were in charge of the Archakship, after whose death, the said Thirumiah

having been himself in charge of the same for sometime, nominated one Sanjiviah in his stead and left the place without permission. Accordingly the Shekdar has given order to the effect that the said Sanjiviah should continue as Archak until Thimmiah made his appearance. Some time after the Shekdar reported that this Sanjiviah left the place on the ground that it is not convenient for him to ~~attend~~ stop at Ganapalur and attend to his business and push his son-in-law, the appeal petitioner Rangappa in his place. As Thimmiah did not turn up for a reasonable time, the appeal petitioner Rangappa the present archak was recommended to the Dy. Commissioner for being appointed as archak of the temple.

In the meanwhile before any order was passed by the Dy. Commissioner in re the appointment of Rangappa as Archak, Thimmiah Lavery appeared before the Dy. Commissioner stated that he has been the real claimant for the archakship, that he was disabled to do his duties on account of old age and that therefore his name might now be registered as archak and that his brother's son one Ramachari might be allowed to look after the work. Upon which orders were issued to the Amildar accordingly.

Thereupon the appeal petitioner Rangappa preferred an appeal to Government.

The entire correspondence
on the subject is herewith
submitted as required.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed. servt.
Lt. Spoerry
Dy. Commissioner.

(Draft as per 2nd (x) order)
814

Inwd F 33-06 Mysore

To,

The Dy Commr
Bangalore Dt

5436 Encls 2 Orgl documents
Dfiles 9.6.07

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No 129 of the 5th March 1907 reporting on the appeal petition of Ramesubba of Sarjapalm in the Hoskote Taluk regarding the Archak-ship of the Sri Varada-rajaswami temple at the place, I am directed to forward

herewith two documents
in original produced
by the Advocate for
the appellant which
go to show that the
Archakeship in question
had been mortgaged
by one Venkatappa by
the appellants father
& that it was latterly
redeemed & that ever
since, the appellant
has been in the enjoyment
of the Archakeship & the

past nearly 18 years.

2. I am to request the favour of your reporting as to whether the appellant has really been performing the duties of the Archdeacon enjoying the perquisites attached thereto for the past 18 years and also furnishing your opinion on the genuineness or otherwise of the two documents now produced.

3. We have

of a detailed report

is requested. The records on the subject-
ed. herewith & reject resubmission.

Thank you

Ilcs'nden

30/5/07

Secy Mun's Dept

30/5/07

VII Urgent 31 i/c.
16/9 Paid. Mobilization 1910 + 11 is proposed coming.
From 3/9/1910
The Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore, Revenue Department, (Inamdari Branch)

Dated

Despatched 15th Sept-1910

Received

General No.

Dr. No. 14

Enclosure No. One file with a letter

Secy letter no 5736 dt 6-6-1907.

Reporting as to whether Rangappa of Gangalur in the Hoskote Taluk has been performing the duties of Archak of Sri Varadaraja Swamy temple at Gangalur for the past 18 years enjoying the perquisites attached to the Archak Ship

GPB—70 reams—27 12 09

M. S. No. 14

One file with two documents etc

Dated 15th September 1908

From

B. J. Kumarasami Naik Esq., B. A.

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District

To

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer Esq., B. A.

Officiating Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments,

(Inamarai Branch)

Sir,

With reference to your letter No: 5736 d/6-6-07, forwarding two documents produced by the advocate (Haq &) for appellant Rangappa in support of his claim to the Archikship of the Shree Varadarajaswami temple at Ganagalur in the Hoskote Taluk, and calling for a report as to whether the appellant has been really performing the duties of the Archik enjoying the perquisites attached thereto for the past 18 years and also for opinion as to the genuineness or otherwise of the documents, I have the honor to state as follows.

Both Rangappa the appellant and the marginally noted witnesses were examined by the Hoskote Taluk Amildar

1. Bhajantri Thimmaraya
2. Dobi Muniappa
3. Patel Rasool Sahib
4. Vobanna
5. Munia
6. Pensioned Shilladar Sheik Mohamed
7. Gurappa
8. Chikkanal appa
9. Ramiah
10. Kondappa
11. Chick Timpati Appanna
12. Lakkur Ameersab
13. Do — Appanna

With reference to the 1st: point viz enjoyment of poojaship with perquisites attached thereto Rangappa the appellant admits that he has been performing the pooja only for the past 10 or 12 years having been — absent from the place for 7—8 years subsequent to

Sarvadhari 1889, when he redeemed the documents by
haying money to Puttamma, that one Sanjeevish his
sister's husband was doing pooja during the period
of his absence, and that he does not know to whom
Sanjeevish had let out the Inam lands for cultivatin
during the said period of 7 or 8 years. The witnesses
from 1 to 10 depose that Varadappa was doing pooja
and after him his son-in-law Thimmappa the res-
pondent, and that on the latter leaving Gangajalur,
Sanjeevish and after him Ranjappa were appointed
to perform pooja and that accordingly Ranjappa
has been doing pooja for the past 10 or 14 years.

2. It is seen from the Sheikdar's reports
Hag 9) Nos: 223 and 206 dated 25-8-99 and 25-11-1900
and from the Mahajar dated 20-10-1900 that —
Hag 9) Thimmappa left Gangajalur in 1899 appointing San-
jeevish who in turn appointed Ranjappa for pooja-
rike.

3. From the above facts, it is clear that Ranjappa
has been performing pooja subsequent to 1899 i.e, only
for 10 or 11 years and not for the past 18 years as
alleged by him.

4. As regards the 2nd point viz the genuineness
of the documents, Ranjappa has stated that the
witnesses who attested the documents of 1859 are —
dead, that he does not know who the writer of the
document was, that he does not know either the
attesting witnesses or the writer of the 2nd document
of 1874 as the same was during his minority, 1906
forcibly written by Varadappa, that he redeemed
these documents by paying money to Puttamma
wife of Varadappa, and has offered the receipt for
posting to have been granted by Puttamma and
written on the reverse of the document of 1874

as the sole evidence of his claim. He defends receipt for the proof of the genuineness of the documents of 1859 and 1874.

5. The Redemption of the documents is alleged to have taken place at Chick Tirupati. Of the 4 persons who are alleged to have attested it, two are dead. The writer of the receipt Appanna (11th Witness) denies having done so, but the witness (10th) Kondappa says that the redemption is true. Two other witnesses Lallkur Ahmed sab (12th) and Appanna (13th) also say that payment was made in their presence. That these two latter persons are unworthy of credit is clear from the fact that Ranjappa has stated before the Shirastadar of Hoskote Taluk on 24-4-09 that he can adduce no other evidence except that of the two living attestors of the receipt.

6. Both Ranjappa and Konda the 6th witness say that Thimmappa the respondent was present at the time the receipt was executed. If this were true, Thimmappa ~~Thimmappa~~ would have been asked to attest the receipt as an important witness.

7. The 8th and 9th witnesses say that they are not aware of the existence of documents of 1859 and 1874, but that they know that Puttamma was demanding Ranjappa for the payment of the mortgage amount, ~~against~~

8. But against the statement of the above persons, there is evidence of 6th and 7th witnesses who are aged persons having something to do with the temple. These State that they are not aware either of the execution of the documents or the redemption thereof.

9. Moreover, in all the previous correspondence and also in the depositions of 1st, 3rd, 4th and 5th witnesses who had attained majority in the year 1859 when the original document is purported to have been

executed, there is nothing to show that Rangappa's ancestors were performing pooja prior to 1859. If Rangappa was a descendant of the real Hakdars, this matter would not have been kept in the dark.

10. In the above circumstances, concurring with the Amildar and the Assistant Commissioner, I am of opinion that the documents in question are not genuine.

11. The entire file of the vernacular records — together with the documents received from you is herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.
1874

Before the Government of His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. — of 1910-11

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Rangappa Thimmappa

SUBJECT.

Archakship of the Sri Varadaraja Swamy temple at Ganagalur, Hoskote Taluk

Facts of the Case

The Sri Varadaraja Swamy temple at Ganagalur is a mungai inam endowed with wet and dry inam lands. One Venkadappa and his son Varadappa were Pujaries of this temple Varadappa having no male issue, resptt Thimmappa who was son-in-law and sisters son of Varadappa

succeeded him. Respt left the village about the year 1898 and ~~after~~ one Sanjeevappa of channarayanapura performed puja for a short time. Then aplt Rangappa, a son-in-law of the Sanjeevappa, began to perform puja in the year 1905, ~~the Villagers~~ petitions were presented ~~petitions~~ about this pujaristhip, some of the villagers being in favour of the aplt, and some, in favour of the respdt. On receipt of a report submitted by the Amildar after enquiry, the Dy. Commr of the Bangalore Distt, directed that the respdt should be registered as the Pujari. Aplt then appealed to Govt urging that he belonged to the Nakkar family, that his father Sanjeevappa had mortgaged the office to Pujari Venkatappa refd. to above and that aplt had redeemed the mortgage by paying the money

To Puttamma wife of Varadappa

dau — in-law V

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*

and had been performing puja for about ~~18~~ 18 years The documents relied upon by the aplt having been produced before Govt for the first time, the Dy Commr was requested to enquire about the genuineness of these ~~documents~~ and in submitting his opinion in the matter, to report also if aplt had been performing puja for 18 years as alleged. The Dy. Commr now reports that the documents are not genuine and that aplt had been performing puja since 1899 only and not for 18 years as alleged by him.

The parties were heard before Govt on 25th novr 1910, the aplt being represented by an advocate Mr.

Order

The documents were introduced at a very late stage and the Dy Commr is right in holding

that they have not been proved.

The appeal is dismissed and the Dy. Commr's. order is confirmed. Petn

---

No. 1609 — Encl. to Dy 20-12-33-06

Copy is forwarded to the Dy Commr, Bangalore Dist, with the records received with his Letter no 14 dated 15th Septr 1910.

By order,
(Crs. order) [signature]
For Secretary.

No 1610-11 — Dy 20-12-33-06

Copies to Mr D Raghavachar, Advocate for the aplt and to respdt Thimmappa of Gangavalli

By order
(Dft) [signature]
For Secretary 13/12

[signature]
15-12-10

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja

of Mysore.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Appeal No. of 1910-11.

Appellant. Respondent.

Rangappa. Vs. Thimmappa.

Subject.

Archakship of the Sri Varadaraja Swamy temple at Gangalur, Hoskote Taluk.

Facts of the case.

The Sri Varadaraja Swamy temple at Gangalur is a Inzrai institution endowed with wet and dry Inam lands. One Venkatappa and his son Varadappa were Pujaries of this temple, Varadappa having no male issue, respondant Thimmappa son-in-law and sister's son of Varadappa succeeded him. Respondent left the village about the ye 1898 and one Sanjeevappa of Channarayanapur performed puja for a short time. Then appellant Rangappa, a son-in-law of this Sanjee vappa, began to perform Puja. In the year 1905, petitions were presented about the pujarishipp; some of the villagers being in favour of the appellant, and some, in fav of the respondent. On receipt of a report submitted by the Ami after enquiry, the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District directed that the respondent should be registered as the pujar Appellant then appealed to Government urging that he belonged

the hakdar family, that his father Sanjeevappa had ~~&&~~ mortgaged the office to Pujari Venkatappa referred to above and that the appellant had redeemed the mortgage by paying the money due to Puttamma wife of Varadappa and daughter-in-law of Venkatappa and had been performing puja for about 18 years. The documents relied upon by the appellant having been produced before Government for the first time, the Deputy Commissioner was requested to enquire about the genuineness of these and in submitting his opinion in the matter, to report also if appellant had been performing puja for 18 years as alleged. The Deputy Commissioner now reports that the documents are not genuine and that appellant had been performing puja since 1899 only and not for 18 years as alleged by him.

The parties were heard before Government on 25th November 1910, the appellant being represented by an advocate also.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

O r d e r .

The documents were introduced at a very late stage and the Deputy Commissioner is right in holding that they have not been proved.

The appeal is dismissed and the Deputy Commissioner's order is confirmed.

P.T.O

~~For Offg Secretary to Government.~~

Memo 1609 Dy 20-12-1910 Encl file
Mun 33-06

No. Dated Bangalore, Dec 1910

Copy is forwarded to the Dy. Commr, Bangalore District, with the records received with his letter no. 14 Dy 15th Septr 1910

By order,

16/12/1910
for Off. Secretary

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai, dated 20th December 1910.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

Appeal No of 1910-11

Appellant. vs Respondent

Rangappa

Subject

Archakship of the Sri Varadarajaswami temple at Ganagalur, Hoskote Taluk.

Facts of the case

The Sri Varadarajaswami temple at Ganagalur is a Muzrai institution endowed with wet and dry inam lands. One Venkatappa and his son Varadappa were pujaris of this temple. Varadappa having no male issue, respondent Thimmappa, son-in-law and sister's son of Varadappa, succeeded him. Respondent left the village about the year 1898 and one Sanjeevappa of Chinnarayapatna performed puja for a short time. Then appellant Rangappa a son-in-law of this Sanjeevappa, began to perform puja. In the year 1905, petitions were presented about the pujarship, some of the villagers being in favor of the appellant, and some, in favor of the respondent. On receipt of a report submitted by the Amildar after enquiry, the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District directed that the respondent should be registered as the pujari. Appellant then appealed to Government urging that he belonged to the Hindu family that his father Sanjeevappa had mortgaged the office to pujari Venkatappa referred to above and that the appellant had redeemed the mortgage by paying the money due to Puttamma, wife of Varadappa and daughter-in-law of Venkatappa and had been performing puja for about 18 years. The documents relied upon by the appellant having been produced before Government for the first time, the Deputy Commissioner was requested to enquire about the genuineness of these and in submitting his opinion in the matter, to report also if appellant had been performing puja for 18 years as alleged. The Deputy Commissioner now reports that the documents are not genuine and that appellant had been performing puja since 1899 only and not for 18 years as alleged by him.

The parties were heard before Government on 25th November 1910, the appellant being represented by an advocate also.

Order

The documents were introduced at a very late stage and the Deputy Commissioner is right in holding that they have not been proved.

The appeal is dismissed and the Deputy Commissioner's order is confirmed.

MEMO No. 1609—MUZ. F. 33-06, DATED BANGALORE, 20TH DECEMBER 1910.

Copy is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, with the records received with his letter No. 11, dated 15th September 1910.

Draft [illegible]

for Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

End—C. R.

1910-1

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHN
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

Dated 20th December 1910

No. 1609
Muz. F. 33-06

Passing order on the archakship of the Sri Varadarajaswami temple at Ganagalur in the Hoskote Taluk.

GPB—5 1 11—200

Ry Revenue
D 1301
1/1/1911

Wantchatharo
Certificate Tribe
Assistant Superintendent
Naga Hills
Kohima
1/1/1911

ಶ್ರೀ ಗುರುಭ್ಯೋ ನಮಃ

ಶ್ರೀ ಶಂಕರಭಗವತ್ಪಾದಾಚಾರ್ಯ ವಿರಚಿತಂ

ಸಾಧನಪಂಚಕಂ

ವೇದೋ ನಿತ್ಯಮಧೀಯತಾಂ ತದುದಿತಂ ಕರ್ಮ ಸ್ವನುಷ್ಠೀಯತಾಂ
ತೇನೇಶಸ್ಯ ವಿಧೀಯತಾಮಪಚಿತಿಃ ಕಾಮ್ಯೇ ಮತಿಸ್ತ್ಯಜ್ಯತಾಂ
ಪಾಪೌಘಃ ಪರಿಧೂಯತಾಂ ಭವಸುಖೇ ದೋಷೋಽನುಸಂಧೀಯತಾಂ
ಆತ್ಮೇಚ್ಛಾ ವ್ಯವಸೀಯತಾಂ ನಿಜಗೃಹಾತ್ತೂರ್ಣಂ ವಿನಿರ್ಗಮ್ಯತಾಂ
ಸಂಗಃ ಸತ್ಸು ವಿಧೀಯತಾಂ ಭಗವತೋ ಭಕ್ತಿರ್ದೃಢಾಽಽಧೀಯತಾಂ
ಶಾಂತ್ಯಾದಿಃ ಪರಿಚೀಯತಾಂ ದೃಢತರಂ ಕರ್ಮಾಶು ಸಂತ್ಯಜ್ಯತಾಂ
ಸ್ವಾತ್ಮಾ ನಿತ್ಯವಿಲೋಕ್ಯತಾಮವಿರತಂ ಭ್ರಾಂತಿಃ ಪರಿತ್ಯಜ್ಯತಾಂ
ಮಾಯಾಕಾರ್ಯಮಸತ್ತಯಾ ಸಮಧಿಗಮ್ಯತಾಂ ತದ್ಬ್ರಹ್ಮ ಸಂಪದ್ಯತಾಂ

ವೇದೋ ನಿತ್ಯಮಧೀಯತಾಂ ತದುದಿತಂ ಕರ್ಮ ಸ್ವನುಷ್ಠೀಯತಾಂ
ತೇನೇಶಸ್ಯ ವಿಧೀಯತಾಮಪಚಿತಿಃ ಕಾಮ್ಯೇ ಮತಿಸ್ತ್ಯಜ್ಯತಾಂ
ಪಾಪೌಘಃ ಪರಿಧೂಯತಾಂ ಭವಸುಖೇ ದೋಷೋಽನುಸಂಧೀಯತಾಂ
ಆತ್ಮೇಚ್ಛಾ ವ್ಯವಸೀಯತಾಂ ನಿಜಗೃಹಾತ್ತೂರ್ಣಂ ವಿನಿರ್ಗಮ್ಯತಾಂ
ಸಂಗಃ ಸತ್ಸು ವಿಧೀಯತಾಂ ಭಗವತೋ ಭಕ್ತಿರ್ದೃಢಾಽಽಧೀಯತಾಂ
ಶಾಂತ್ಯಾದಿಃ ಪರಿಚೀಯತಾಂ ದೃಢತರಂ ಕರ್ಮಾಶು ಸಂತ್ಯಜ್ಯತಾಂ
ಸ್ವಾತ್ಮಾ ನಿತ್ಯವಿಲೋಕ್ಯತಾಮವಿರತಂ ಭ್ರಾಂತಿಃ ಪರಿತ್ಯಜ್ಯತಾಂ
ಮಾಯಾಕಾರ್ಯಮಸತ್ತಯಾ ಸಮಧಿಗಮ್ಯತಾಂ ತದ್ಬ್ರಹ್ಮ ಸಂಪದ್ಯತಾಂ

ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ಲೇಖನಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿ

ಅಂತರ್ಜಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಭ್ಯವಿರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಉಪಯುಕ್ತ

ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಆಧಾರಿತ ಜಾಲತಾಣಗಳ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಪಟ್ಟಿ

ಮಾಡಿ ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಜಾಲತಾಣಕ್ಕೆ ಭೇಟಿ ನೀಡಿ

ನಿಮಗೆ ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವೆನಿಸಿದ ಮಾಹಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ

ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅನಿಸಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಮೂಲ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರೋಪಾಯಗಳನ್ನು

ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಪರಿಣಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ

ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ನಿಮ್ಮ ಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಚರಿಸಿದ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು

ಸಮಾರಂಭದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ

ಬರೆಯಿರಿ. ಸಮಾರಂಭದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದ

ಗಣ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳು, ಅವರು ನೀಡಿದ ಸಂದೇಶಗಳ

ಸಾರಾಂಶ ಮತ್ತು ಸಮಾರಂಭದ ಯಶಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಕಾರಣರಾದವರ

ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ.

ಕೆ ೨೫-೧-೨೦೧೭

ಗಣ್ಯರಾದವರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು

No 2380 dt 23-3-1911 [illegible]
Mus. D. 33-06

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

D 1543

Petn Present



They are informed that as the matter has been decided finally in the representation of the parties interested, nothing further can be done on their representation, unless they bring about a Compromise & get a razinama filed. An intimation may be given to them.

17/3/11

4

ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡೆವು.

Off. as per C/S memo

2541 తేది 28/4/1911
నెం. 33-06

మేము మీ యొక్క వివరణ కోసం
ఎదురు చూస్తున్నట్లు మీకు
తెలియజేయడమైనది

దీనిపై మీరు తగిన చర్యలు
తీసుకుని ఎన్ని అంకెలు పెట్టగలరో
అన్ని అంకెలు పెట్టగలరని
ఆశిస్తున్నాము

చర్యలు తీసుకుని వివరణ
రాగానే మేము దానిని పరిశీలించి
తగిన నిర్ణయం తీసుకోగలము
కావున 1911 సం॥ మే నెల 15వ తేదీ
లోపు మీ నుండి వివరణ రాగలదని
ఆశిస్తున్నాము.

ఈ విషయం మీకు తెలియజేయడమైనది
దీనిపై మీరు తగిన చర్యలు తీసుకుని
ఎన్ని అంకెలు పెట్టగలరో అన్ని
అంకెలు పెట్టగలరని మీ నుండి
వివరణ రాగానే మేము తగిన నిర్ణయం
తీసుకోగలము. కావున మీ నుండి
వివరణ రాగలదని ఆశిస్తున్నాము

దినం ఇట్లు
రాజేంద్ర దత్ చటోపాధ్యాయ, ఇన్‌స్పెక్టర్ జనరల్ ఆఫ్ పోస్ట్స్

[illegible]

By order

Crs. order
Dy
30/3/1911
DCF)
28/3/11
for Dy. Secretary

Copy to the Dy. No 2542 Dt 3/4/11.
Jmn 33-06

Canara, Bangalore for
in centre of this office

Memo no. 2361 Dt 23-3-1911

By order

DCF)
28/3/11
for Dy. Secretary

Copy to Thimmappa
Dy
30/3/1911

No 2543 Dt 3/4/1911.
Jmn 33-06